NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are ***not*** identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: Dover	School: North Dover School
Chief School Administrator: Robert Becker	Address: 51 Highland Avenue Dover, NJ 07801
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: bbecker@dover-nj.org	Grade Levels: Pre-K through Grade 6
Title I Contact: Kevin Bullock	Principal: Kathryn Rutan
Title I Contact E-mail: kbullock@dover-nj.org	Principal's E-mail: krutan@dover-nj.org
Title I Contact Phone Number: 973-989-2000	Principal's Phone Number: 973-989-2020

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☑ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

Kathryn Rutan Kathryn Rutan June 15, 2015

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Principal's Name (Print) **Principal's Signature** **Date**

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 5 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 5,451,566, which comprised 94.1% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $4,948,026, which will comprise 93% % of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Class Size Reduction	1	Intervention to Address Student Achievement	100 – 100 Employee Salaries	$233,831
			200 – 200 Employee Benefits	$105,711
Title I Extended-year Summer Program	2 and 3	Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement	100 – 100 Employee Salaries	$18,363
Title I Extended-day Programs	2 and 3	Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement	100 – 100 Employee Salaries	$16,000
Parent Newsletters & Parent Library supplies	2 and 3	Parental Involvement	200 – 600	$900
Parent Involvement Activities- Workshop Facilitators, Supplies, etc.	2 and 3	Parental Involvement	100 – 100 Employee Salaries and 200 – 600 Non-instructional Supplies	$3,078

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): *"The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

***Add lines as necessary**.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Rosalie Harris	PTA President	X	X	X	
Diana Macareno	PTA President	X	X	X	
Melody Adrada	Paraprofessional	X	X	X	
Ester Scott	Bilingual Teacher	X	X	X	
Sharon Leister	G&T Teacher	X	X	X	
Kathryn Barrows	Teacher	X	X	X	
Robin Kurbansade	Special Education Teacher	X	X	X	
Kathryn Rutan	Principal	X	X	X	
Patrick Pandolfo	Vice Principal	X	X	X	
Lou Taxiarchou	District HIB Specialist	X	X	X	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): *"The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"*

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

Add lines as necessary.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Rosalie Harris	PTA President	X	X	X	
Diana Macareno	PTA President	X	X	X	
Melody Adrada	Paraprofessional	X	X	X	
Ester Scott	Bilingual Teacher	X	X	X	
Sharon Leister	G&T Teacher	X	X	X	
Kathryn Barrows	Teacher	X	X	X	
Robin Kurbansade	Special Education Teacher	X	X	X	
Kathryn Rutan	Principal	X	X	X	
Patrick Pandolfo	Vice Principal	X	X	X	
Lou Taxiarchou	District HIB Specialist	X	X	X	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:
The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
September 23, 2015	Media Center	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
September 23, 2015	Media Center	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
November 19, 2014	Cafeteria	Bilingual Family Literacy Night	X		X	
March 26, 2015	Auditorium	Grades K-2 Family Literacy Night	X		X	
April 1, 2015	Auditorium	Grades 3-6 Family Literacy Night	X		X	
June 9, 2015	Media Center	Program Evaluation	X		X	

Add rows as necessary.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	*Teachers, students, parents and community working collaboratively to provide an optimum and productive learning environment for students to achieve their maximum potential.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (*Evaluation*). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   The 2014-15 Title I School-wide Plan was implemented as planned with the hiring of staff members to reduce the size of classrooms at different grade levels; an increased emphasis on the use of data to drive instruction and thus, address the needs of at risk students; and the inclusion of an extended school day/year tutoring program to provide remedial assistance for those students experiencing difficulty in math and/or language arts.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The North Dover School staff is overwhelming positive and supportive of the Title I Schoolwide Program as evidenced by their willingness to tutor at risk students during the summer, after school and on Saturday mornings; a willingness to analyze and evaluate student progress using data from varied sources to drive instruction. In addition, grade level teams planned and presented parental programs (Family Literacy Nights) so that families could better understand their role as a child's first teacher and thus, could help their children at home reinforcing research based reading strategies employed in the classroom.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

   The majority of our parents who attended the PAC meetings and/or Family Literacy Nights were enthusiastic about our extended day/year tutoring programs and Family Literacy Programs but attendance was not always consistent due to family scheduling conflicts, lack of transportation for after/before/evening school programs and often the erratic work hours of the many parents who are working night shifts or two jobs to support their family.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

   The implementation process of the Title I schoolwide program was smoothly executed due to careful planning by the district and building administration prior to the start of the new school year. The needs of the school were accurately determined based upon the most recent test data, stakeholder surveys and administrative input/analysis. The hiring/reassignment of staff members to reduce class size at various grade levels was planned/accomplished prior to the start of the school year. As a result of the staff's

attendance/ participation at instructional strategies webinars, building based PLCs and the careful analysis of the previous year's NJASK test results, the importance of using data to drive instruction was evident to all staff members. Thus, this paradigm shift occurred naturally and with minimal staff resistance. One area of weakness in the implementation of our schoolwide program was the time lag between the notification of parents/guardians about our extended day/year program and the return of the paperwork indicating parent consent or refusal to attend the afterschool, early morning or Saturday morning programs. Often the building administration or teachers would need to reach out numerous times to families to explain the program and ask them to return the necessary paperwork. The families' reluctance to commit was often due to time constraints, scheduling conflicts or transportation to/from the program.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

Stakeholders were invited to attend Title I Parent Advisory Council meetings held in the fall and spring of the year, written communication about Title I programs, clearly stated in both Spanish and English, were either mailed or sent home with the students, notices in the weekly Menugram/newsletter further illustrated the importance of these programs, information about upcoming events were posted on the school website and parents could also call the main office for more information disseminated by bilingual staff members. In addition at all Title I events a participant survey was administered to garner more information about the program from those families in attendance. Finally, parents were strongly encouraged to review/critique the schoolwide programs and parent compact to provide additional insights as valued stakeholders.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

The staff recognizes the need to address the academic, social and behavioral needs of all students to ensure their academic success and so, the staff fully supports the schoolwide programs supported by Title I funding as evidenced by their comments on staff surveys, informal dialogues with building administrators and PLC meetings minutes. The staff recognizes the importance of integrated instruction across all content areas coupled with differentiated instruction and authentic formative and summative assessments; with administrative support the staff have embraced this paradigm shift in lesson planning and delivery. In addition, on a whole, the staff strongly feels that the extended day/extended year tutoring program is extremely beneficial. Also, with the increased emphasis on a home/school connection staff members are diligently recruiting support from all families for these Title I programs so as to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core State Standards as measured by the PARCC tests.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

From *the responses to our parent surveys as well as the honest discussions at PAC meetings, it was clear that our parents support the school's vision of challenging students across all content areas to ensure that the students will acquire twenty-first*

century skills necessary for academic success now and in the future. Parents also want to feel that they are involved in their child's education and so they look to the school for suggestions and examples of how to strengthen that home/school connections.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

   The primary method of delivery for the extended day/year program was small group instruction conducted by highly qualified staff members.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

   Our school structured the interventions by first identifying students performing below grade level using multiple measures and then providing extended-day tutoring programs to identified students. In addition, RTTT3 funds were utilized to provide job-embedded professional development opportunities such as webinars and opportunities for staff to meet as professional learning communities to explore alternative instructional strategies and interventions.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

    Extended day/afternoon tutoring (60 minute sessions) for students in grades three through six occurred three times a week while students in kindergarten through grade two were invited to attend summer school four times a week with each session lasting three hours.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

    Technology in the building utilized for the Title I programs included individual classroom Promethean Boards, iMac laptop carts, iPad carts, and MAC desktop computers in the Media Center. In addition, staff members utilized various online websites to enhance lesson instruction such as Reading A-Z and RazKids.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

    Technology is an integral component of the success of the schoolwide program as evidenced by the high usage of Reading A-Z and RazKids to reinforce literacy skills, develop skill specific assessments, and track student progress. In addition, teachers had access to websites such Treasures and Go Math, and Tumble Books, which provided additional reinforcement activities in both math and language arts.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4	23	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.
Grade 5	25	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math Saturday morning PARCC test prep classes for ELA and Math	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.
Grade 6	12	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math Saturday morning PARCC test prep classes for ELA and Math	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4	14	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.
Grade 5	11	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math Saturday morning PARCC Test Prep classes for both ELA & Math.	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.
Grade 6	18	TBD	Extended Day Tutoring for Language Arts & Math Saturday morning PARCC Test Prep classes for both ELA & Math.	Some possible causes for our inability to achieve a 100% proficiency rate might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English due to a weak conceptual basis due to a minimal experiential background; a high mobility rate among our students; and a difficulty moving between two languages when comprehending math, reading or writing concepts/strategies. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on NJASK/PARCC tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kindergarten	20	30	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve grade level ELA proficiency as evidenced by this year's retention number coupled with grade level formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English upon arrival in Kindergarten; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for language arts skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 83% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on formative and summative assessments. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented. As a result, ELA instruction must be explicit, systematic and reflected of the spirit of the CCSS on a daily basis if students are to achieve the rigorous benchmarks established by the NJDOE.
Grade 1	24	30	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve grade level ELA proficiency as evidenced by this year's retention number (12) coupled with grade level formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English upon arrival in Kindergarten; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for language arts skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 83% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on formative and summative assessments. In addition, our high mobility rate during a

				school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented. As a result, ELA instruction must be explicit, systematic and reflected of the spirit of the CCSS on a daily basis if students are to achieve the rigorous benchmarks established by the NDOE.
Grade 2	22	27	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve grade level ELA proficiency as evidenced by this year's retention number (12) coupled with grade level formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English upon arrival in Kindergarten; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for language arts skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on formative and summative assessments. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented. As a result, ELA instruction must be explicit, systematic and reflected of the rigor and spirit of the CCSS on a daily basis if students are to achieve the rigorous benchmarks established by the NDOE.

Mathematics	**2013 - 2014**	**2014 - 2015**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Pre-Kindergarten	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kindergarten	20	30	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve grade level Math proficiency as evidenced by this year's retention number coupled with grade level formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: students do not have a conceptual understanding of basic math concepts upon entering school; our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English upon arrival in Kindergarten; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for vocabulary skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 80% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on formative and summative assessments. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Grade 1	24	30	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve a proficiency level on grade level math formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for language arts skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 83% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on standardized tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.
Grade 2	20	30	Extended Year Instruction (summer program)	Some possible causes for some students' inability to achieve a proficiency level on grade level math formative and summative assessments (SGO benchmark tests) might include: our students' lack of a strong vocabulary basis in English; a high mobility rate among our students; a weak experiential basis for language arts skills, and difficulty moving between two languages in both reading and writing. With over 83% of our student population designated as English Language Learners, these ELL students often experience difficulty transitioning between two languages when assessed in English on standardized tests. In addition, our high mobility rate during a school year often disrupts the continuous scope and sequence of skills being presented.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

<table>
<tr><th>1
Content</th><th>2
Group</th><th>3
Intervention</th><th>4
Effective
Yes-No</th><th>5
Documentation of
Effectiveness</th><th>6
Measurable Outcomes
(Outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td>ELA
Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Data Driven Instruction to provide individualized assistance in LAL and mathematics within a small group setting to ensure that students attain proficiency or advanced proficiency scores on the new PARCC tests and thus, enabling the school to meet the state's Annual Performance Target benchmarks.</td><td>Yes</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table><tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr><tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr><tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Intensive and leveled reading groups utilizing the online programs of ***Reading A-Z, Vocabulary A-Z, and/or RazKids*** to systematically integrate across all content areas the essential reading components of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension into reinforcement opportunities at home as well as to track student progress using a leveled reading approach that is statistically correlated</td><td>Yes</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table><tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr><tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr><tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>with the current basal series, Treasures</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Schoolwide use of Go Math Series coupled with research based instructional strategies to ensure a systematic and uniform approach to teaching math at all grade levels. Grade level and inter-grade level meetings to monitor the progression of skills as defined by the CCSS.</td><td>Yes</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA
Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Increased use of Professional Learning Committees that address specific building concerns that may impede academic achievement</td><td>TBD</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special</td><td>Ensuring standards based instruction is embedded in</td><td>TBD</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual</td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>content specific classes such as art, health, science, social studies to scaffold LAL TBD instruction in mainstream classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td>
<td>SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA
Math</td>
<td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaed</td>
<td>Inclusion of PARCC preparation periods a minimum of 2-3x a week to prepare students to effectively utilized the technological features on the PARCC tests. Purchase of</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td>
<td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA
Math</td>
<td>All Students including ELL, Special</td>
<td>Grade level planning of cross-curricular units that</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades</td>
<td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual</td>
</tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>reflect the rigor and complexity of reading passages as specified by the CCSS and NJDOE Model Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td>
<td>SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA
Math</td>
<td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Transition of teacher directed instruction to a blended, cross-curricular instructional approach with an emphasis on differentiated instruction to better address the specific needs of individual students in an effort to improve academic achievement.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td>
<td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>*Increase math fluency of basic fact recall for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division using direct instruction, online practice, and individualized student practice to enhance math computational skills.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td>
<td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA
Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Use of grade level teams to examine and analyze standardized test data and to disaggregate test data by class, teacher, and subgroups in an effort to ascertain grade level strengths and weaknesses and then create individualized prescriptive plans to address deficiencies</td><td>TBD</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA
Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Each grade level team will develop a common and balanced system of assessments and then the teachers will grade some of these assessments collaboratively to track student progress across the grade level as well as develop uniform grade level expectations of proficiency.

Submission of grade level assessment data provided monthly to building administration.</td><td>TBD</td><td>Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6

Student Portfolios (pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades)

Attainment of Student Growth Objectives</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies**

<table>
<tr><th>1
Content</th><th>2
Group</th><th>3
Intervention</th><th>4
Effective
Yes-No</th><th>5
Documentation of
Effectiveness</th><th>6
Measurable Outcomes
(Outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td>ELA
Math</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Extended Day (PM) Tutoring: To address the varied and diverse needs and skills of at risk students as identified by homeroom teachers and standardized testing results.</td><td>TBD</td><td>Weekly Attendance statistics, student portfolios, SGO Benchmark and PARCC test scores.</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3
LA</td><td>Gr 3
Math</td><td>Gr 4
LA</td><td>Gr 4
Math</td><td>Gr 5
LA</td><td>Gr 5
Math</td><td>Gr 6
LA</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math
ELA</td><td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>Extended Year:
Saturday AM classes for Grades 5 & 6 students to address the specific and diverse needs of students in this grade level as identified by LAL and Math teachers and standardized testing results.</td><td>TBD</td><td>Weekly Attendance statistics, student portfolios, SGO Benchmark and PARCC test scores.</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3
LA</td><td>Gr 3
Math</td><td>Gr 4
LA</td><td>Gr 4
Math</td><td>Gr 5
LA</td><td>Gr 5
Math</td><td>Gr 6
LA</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

<table>
<tr>
<td>ELA
Math</td>
<td>All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Extended Year Tutoring
To address the varied and diverse needs and skills of at risk students as identified by homeroom teachers and standardized testing results.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Weekly Attendance statistics, student portfolios, SGO Benchmark and PARCC test scores.</td>
<td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 tests with NJASK 2015 using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA Math	All Students including ELL, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	*Provide job-embedded professional development opportunities that correlate to the Common Core State Standards and PARCC tests in order to improve classroom instruction.	Yes	Participant feedback, staff surveys, and administrative review of lesson plans, formal/informal observations, and standardized test data.	There was an increased use of research based differentiated instructional strategies for language arts and reading as evidenced by lesson plans and accompanying administrative comments, grade level discussions, PLC minutes and administrative walk-throughs and lesson observations. During the 2014-2015 school year, a webinar series focusing on *Critical Thinking* was offered to the staff and representatives from each grade level as well as special areas teachers participated in this professional development opportunity.
Math ELA	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Teacher empowerment opportunities at flipped faculty meetings, mini-workshops, at grade level meetings to share current research and best practices with other staff members. These monthly professional development activities focused on improving student achievement within the building.	Yes	Participant feedback, staff surveys, and administrative review of lesson plans, formal/informal observations, and standardized test data.	There was an increased use of research based differentiated instructional strategies for language arts and reading as evidenced by lesson plans and accompanying administrative comments, grade level discussions, PLC minutes and administrative walk-throughs and lesson observations. During the 2014-2015 school year, a webinar series focusing on *Critical Thinking* was offered to the staff and representatives from each grade level as well as special areas teachers participated in this professional development opportunity.
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically	Utilization of grade level meetings to examine data specific to the grade level that might enhance or impede	Yes	Participant feedback, staff surveys, and administrative review of lesson plans, formal/informal observations, and	There was an increased use of research based differentiated instructional strategies for language arts and reading as evidenced by lesson plans and accompanying administrative comments, grade level discussions, PLC minutes

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	Disadvantaged	academic achievement. Then, as a grade level develop appropriate measures to address their concerns.		standardized test data.	and administrative walk-throughs and lesson observations. During the 2014-2015 school year, a webinar series focusing on *Critical Thinking* was offered to the staff and representatives from each grade level as well as special areas teachers participated in this professional development opportunity.
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Horizontal and vertical grade level articulation meetings as well as PLCs across grade levels that specifically address gaps in instruction.	Yes	Grade Level Meeting minutes, participant feedback, discussion topics involving the effective alignment of *Treasures* reading series and *Go Math* series with the Common Core State Standards and NJDOE Model Curriculum.	Increased use of research based instructional strategies for language arts and reading as evidenced by lesson planning and accompanying administrative comments, grade level discussions, PLC minutes and administrative walk-throughs. Increased use of formative and summative assessments spanning the DOK and across all grade levels to monitor student achievement and customize instruction as evidenced in lesson planning, grade level meeting agendas, and PLC minutes/agendas. Increased emphasis on PARCC style of assessments across all grade levels as evidenced by inclusion of CCSS based problems and reading passages in grade level assignments, tests and projects reflecting the rigor and complexity of the CCSS.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Informational Workshops focusing on Academic Achievement as a result of a strong home/school connection	Yes	• Number of Attendees • Parent Surveys and Event Feedback Form • PAC Meeting Discussions	Reinforcement of home/school connections to enhance students' academic achievement through positive compliments and recommended suggestions for improving student performance. A mid/high percentage of our parents were in attendance and was documented on the sign in sheets. Reponses on the parent surveys after each event indicated an overwhelming positive response to the program.
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	*Parent Workshops to support parents in helping their children with homework and other school assignments by offering concrete suggestions for implementation at home	Yes	• Number of Attendees • Parent Surveys and Event Feedback Form • PAC Meeting Discussions	Reinforcement of home/school connections to enhance students' academic achievement through positive compliments and recommended suggestions for improving student performance. A mid/high percentage of our parents were in attendance and was documented on the sign in sheets. Reponses on the parent surveys after each event indicated an overwhelming positive response to the program.
		*Parenting Tip Workshops		• Number of Attendees • Parent Surveys and Event Feedback Form • PAC Meeting Discussions	Reinforcement of home/school connections to enhance students' academic achievement through positive compliments and recommended suggestions for improving student performance. A mid/high percentage of our parents were in attendance and was documented on the sign in sheets. Reponses on the parent surveys after each event indicated an overwhelming positive

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					response to the program.
		Distribution of parenting materials that emphasis home/school connection.		• Number of Attendees • Parent Surveys and Event Feedback Form • PAC Meeting Discussions	Reinforcement of home/school connections to enhance students' academic achievement through positive compliments and recommended suggestions for improving student performance. A mid/high percentage of our parents were in attendance and was documented on the sign in sheets. Reponses on the parent surveys after each event indicated an overwhelming positive response to the program.
		* Cross-curricular family events to promote academics such as Reading and/or Math Extravaganza which will serve to encourage/reinforce home/school connection		• Number of Attendees • Parent Survey and Feedback Form • PAC Meeting Discussions	Reinforcement of home/school connections to enhance students' academic achievement through positive compliments and recommended suggestions for improving student performance. A mid/high percentage of our parents were in attendance and was documented on the sign in sheets. Reponses on the parent surveys after each event indicated an overwhelming positive response to the program.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☒ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

Kathryn S. Rutan	*Kathryn S. Rutan*	6/30/2015
Principal's Name	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2014-2015

<table>
<tr><th>Areas</th><th>Multiple Measures Analyzed</th><th>Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
(Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Achievement – Reading</td><td>NJASK & PARCC Tests – Grades 3,4,5 and 6
A comparison of the state test results for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years in the area of Language Arts/Reading for all students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.. These state test scores provide the administration with the ability to identify at risk students, compare our annual test scores with other schools in the district, other schools in our District Factor Grouping, and with the state average. In addition, student report card data, district and state assessments, individual teacher's SGO results as well as grade level SGO results, formative and summative assessments based upon criterion reference tests using Treasures, and teacher-generated tests and quizzes, provide additional information to drive instruction in this content area.</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 NJASK tests with NJASK 2015 PARCC tests using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

<table>
<tr><th>Areas</th><th>Multiple Measures Analyzed</th><th>Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
(Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Achievement - Writing</td><td>NJASK & PARCC Tests – Grades 3,4,5 and 6
A comparison of the state test results for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years in the area of Language Arts/Reading for all students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.. These state test scores provide the administration with the ability to identify at risk students, compare our annual test scores with other schools in the district, other schools in our District Factor Grouping, and with the state average. In addition, student report card data, district and state assessments, individual teacher's SGO results as well as grade level SGO results, formative and summative assessments based upon criterion reference tests using Treasures, and teacher-generated tests and quizzes, provide additional information to drive instruction in this content area.</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.

Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 NJASK tests with NJASK 2015 PARCC tests using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:

<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Achievement - Mathematics</td><td>NJASK & PARCC Tests – Grades 3,4,5 and 6
A comparison of the state test results for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years in the area of Language Arts/Reading for all students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6.. These state test scores provide the administration with the ability to identify at risk students, compare our annual test scores with other schools in the district, other schools in our District Factor Grouping, and</td><td>Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. To date 100% of the teachers achieved their target goals as specified on their individual SGOs.
Using the most recent available test data, the following information was derived by comparing NJASK 2014 NJASK tests with NJASK 2015 PARCC tests using Annual Performance Target (APT) calculations:
<table>
<tr><td>NJASK</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 3</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 4</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 5</td><td>Gr 6</td><td>Gr 6</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td><td>LA</td><td>Math</td></tr>
<tr><td>2015</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td><td>TBD</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014</td><td>61%</td><td>58%</td><td>54%</td><td>73%</td><td>54%</td><td>71%</td><td>77%</td><td>57%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
	with the state average. In addition, student report card data, district and state assessments, individual teacher's SGO results as well as grade level SGO results, formative and summative assessments based upon criterion reference tests using *Treasures,* and teacher-generated tests and quizzes, provide additional information to drive instruction in this content area.	
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Needs Survey PTA membership, Attendance at Back to School Night, Parent Conferences, Academic Fair, Family Literacy Nights, NJASK Parent Meetings, PAC Meetings	Key findings from the assessments include: • High expectations for student achievement are shared by all staff members and parents, • Continued communication between school and home is essential to academic success, • Inclusion family oriented bilingual programs were enthusiastically received by parents, • Continuation of home/school programs in literacy, math and effective parenting strategies is desired by administration, staff and parents as evidenced by parent and staff surveys. The results indicate that we need to continue our efforts to reach parents and involve them more so that that they feel they are a partner in their child's academic success.
Professional Development	Analysis of Annual Professional Development Survey, the Dover Public School District &North Dover School's Professional Development plans for past and current year Attendance at district/school workshops; Participation in SDE's *Differentiated Instruction webinars*	Reflection on professional development: The results suggest that our staff is becoming more self-directed and confident in establishing and participating in Professional Learning Communities in an effort to involve all staff members in ensuring academic success for all students. Staff members recognize the need to remain current with research based best practices in literacy and mathematics as well as honing their technological skills so as to address the needs of 21st century students in preparation for the PARCC tests. North Dover staff members will continue to actively engage in grade level discussions and PLC opportunities to analyze test data, investigate blended learning across all content areas, share technology usage tips and strategies;

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
	offered on campus Participation in PLCs at North Dover School Staff Participation in building wide CAP program (Collegial Assistance Program Peer observations of the implementation of research based strategies	apply instructional strategies gleaned from content area workshops in lesson planning and delivery; and maintain a strong building-wide emphasis on data driven instruction using the results from multiple measures. This year's *Differentiated Instruction* webinar for North Dover staff members provided our teachers with a plethora of instructional strategies to utilize in their classrooms. Lesson plans and lesson observations in the later half of the year reflected an increase of successful implementation of differentiated instruction across the curriculum. In the future, onsite workshops/webinars specifically targeted for the needs of North Dover staff members would be beneficial.
Leadership	NJASK test results for students in Grades 3-6. Attainment of Annual Performance Targets, District/Building Objectives School Climate Lesson Plan reviews, PD opportunities, classroom/teacher observations, administrative walk-throughs. Teacher attrition rates at North Dover School and Staff Needs Assessment Survey	Analysis of test data to determine the effectiveness of the administrative team in improving academic achievement from year to year Lesson plans are reviewed weekly via the OnCourse website by the administration to ascertain that tangible/evidential assessments are aligned with the lesson objectives and standards. In addition, lesson plans are critically analyzed to ensure that lesson content reflects the revised curricula and addresses the standards that are tested on the NJASK tests. Administrative comments are archived for future reference by staff and administrators. Walk-throughs are conducted on a regular basis to monitor instruction and it alignment with curriculum. Feedback to staff members is provided via email, individual conferences, faculty meetings and when necessary, during post observation meetings. The administrative team actively engages parents, students and teachers in creating and maintaining our school vision. The administrative team supports teachers' instructional efforts and encourages the use of data to evaluate the progress of the school. The administration consistently strives to create a school environment that is orientated toward individuals; encourages community involvement; utilizes a democratic participatory leadership and creates a school climate that is conducive to learning. Using the results from both parent and staff surveys, it was determined that North Dover School focuses on measurable goals for academic achievement as evidenced by student performance measured by various instruments. Stakeholders feel strongly that the administration is approachable and willing to listen to suggestions for change if and when changes are necessary and warranted to support the mission of the school.
School Climate and Culture	*Staff and Parent Needs Assessment Surveys*	Key findings from the surveys include the need for articulation both horizontally and vertically between all grade levels; data driven instruction is intrinsic to

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
	These surveys provide staff and parents with the opportunity to evaluate our school's efforts to provide a positive learning environment, to offer challenging instructional opportunities for all students and to promote strong relationships between parents and North Dover School.	effective teaching; differentiated instruction and assessment are of paramount importance; integrated units of study based upon Common Core State Standards are necessary for academic success in the 21st century; job-embedded and meaningful professional development is intrinsic to building and student success. Utilizing the data gleaned from our staff surveys as well as the Parent Surveys, we concluded that relationships between stakeholders are very positive, the overall school climate supports an environment that is conducive to learning, and that all stakeholders are valued as intrinsic components to student success.
School-Based Youth Services		
Students with Disabilities	Analysis of NJASK scores for students with IEPs and 504s to track academic progress. Analysis of ACCESS, NJPASS, APA and NJASK scores for students in grades 1-6 as well as an internal data analysis/tracking of individual students from year to year.	Our most recent NJASK 2014 test data indicates that 36% or 9/25 of our special education students in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 attained proficiency of advanced proficient status on the language arts section of the NJASK 2014 tests. In math, 32% or 8/25 of our special education students in grades 3, 4, 5, & 6 attained a proficiency status on the math section of the NJASK 2014 tests.
Homeless Students	NA	NA for the 2014-2015 school year
Migrant Students	NA	NA
English Language Learners	Analysis of ACCESS scores and NJASK/NJPASS scores for all ESL and Bilingual Students	Our most recent NJASK 2014 test data indicates that 43% or 12/28of our LEP students in grades 3,4,5 & 6 attained proficiency or advanced proficient status on the language arts section of 2013 NJASK tests. In math, 78.5% or 22/28 LEP students in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 attained proficient or advanced proficient scores. These results indicate a need to provide more support to our ELL students in the bilingual classroom setting.
Economically Disadvantaged	Analysis of ACCESS, NJPASS, APA and NJASK scores for students in grades 1-6 as well as an internal data analysis/tracking of individual students from year to year.	Analysis of our most recent 2014 NJASK test data revealed that 80.9% of our Economically Disadvantaged students scored proficient or advanced proficient on the math section of the tests while 72.9% of the ED students scored proficient or advanced proficient on the ELA section of the NJASK tests.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

The needs assessment was conducted using a multi-tiered approach. A comprehensive needs assessment was conducted formally and informally among parents, teachers, and other stakeholders over a period of several months. The school stakeholders created a school profile by assessing the current status of the school with respect to student needs, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

Data released by the NJDOE pertaining to the NJASK results for all student subgroups is a primary source of data that is collected by the Assistant Superintendent of Schools and compiled in a district database. The scores of students in the district less than one year are removed and the subgroup scores are analyzed. Scores are compared with Annual Performance Target scores from previous years for this school as well as with other elementary schools within the district. The NJDOE's School Performance Report data is also analyzed, and the results are compared to county and state averages. The building administration reviewed the data both at faculty meetings and where appropriate, parent meetings such as Parent Advisory Council meetings.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

The State of New Jersey ensures NJASK scores are statistically reliable as detailed in the 2014 NJASK Technical Reports for Grades 3-8 which can be accessed at http://www.state.nj.us/education/assessment/es/njask_tech_report14.pdf

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

As evidenced by lower scores in some grade levels in either ELA and/or Math on the NJASK 2014 tests, our students continue to struggle with critical thinking and problem solving skills. The teachers fully comprehend using data to drive instruction is imperative; that differentiation of instruction and meaningful formative assessments should occur in every lesson, and instruction should be integrated across all content areas with a specific emphasis upon the non-fiction genre at every grade level.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

North Dover School administrators and teachers fully support the concept that job-embedded professional development activities should be

supported by educational research and best practices that will enable staff members to fully comprehend the underlying pedagogy of effective instructional strategies in mathematics and language arts as well as utilizing age-appropriate resources to address the varied needs of our students. Using the data from recent state tests, it appears that the successful acquisition and utilization of reading comprehension and math problem solving skills by elementary students is still a major area of concern, and so the staff is working diligently to address the spirit and content of the Common Core State Standards to ensure that all students acquire the necessary skills for success in college and/or workplace in the twenty-first century.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

In addition to using a district database to track students' achievement on state assessments, pre-and post-assessments (SGO benchmark tests, running records in language arts, student portfolios along with student report card grades and teacher recommendations are used to identify at-risk students in a timely manner throughout the school year.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

Educationally at-risk students in grades 3-6 were afforded opportunities to attend extended-day tutoring sessions in both language arts and mathematics; in addition morning and afternoon extended day tutoring sessions as well as Saturday morning tutoring programs for both language arts and math were offered to at risk students in grades 5-6. Also, a summer school session was held for educationally at-risk students in grades K-2.

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? NA

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students? NA

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Teachers are engaged in decisions regarding the appropriate use of assessments through at faculty and grade level meetings. During these bimonthly meetings, teachers review state assessment data, discuss effective instructional strategies, and develop appropriate assessments. In addition, grade level and content area PLCs were held at North Dover School to examine the current curriculum, the scope and sequence of ELA and math concepts as delineated by the CCSS, to suggest possible changes to the building administration as a result of these inter/intra grade level discussions, to implement effective research based instructional strategies that reflect the rigor of the CCSS across all content areas and grade levels, and to engage teachers in decisions regarding the use of varied academic assessments so as to provide detailed student and program information as well as to improve the current instructional program. Also, staff members are provided with weekly team collaboration time to examine and analyze data in order to determine appropriate interventions that will best address the needs of our students.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

Utilizing current educational research and suggestions to align future academic success with an effective transition process from preschool to kindergarten and elementary to middle school, North Dover School has implemented the following:

- Careful monitoring and assessment of each student's school readiness prior to entering kindergarten and during the preschool and kindergarten school year

- Emphasis on the importance of family involvement with the school
- Reinforcement of ongoing home-school connections through regular communication, parent handouts and conferences
- Encouragement to join North Dover School's Parent Teacher Association
- Invitations to visit preschool and kindergarten classes during orientation programs held prior to the youngsters entering school in September
- Provide bilingual parent and child orientation programs after spring registration to review current building procedures, programs and address parent concerns
- Invitations for a student as well as parent orientation to Dover Middle School
- Tour of Dover Middle School before students leave sixth grade
- Emphasizing various independent learning activities and strategies to assist sixth graders into middle school
- Dissemination of information regarding preschool and/or kindergarten programs at North Dover School as well as middle school programs at Dover Middle School.
- Students who enroll during the school year are provided with a peer mentor to assist in the transition. Parents are given a tour of the building and are able to meet the teacher and building administrators on the first day of classes.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

In addition to closely analyzing the item analysis from the comprehensive needs assessment surveys, the building stakeholders review longitudinal data spanning several years worth of state assessment data, school report card/school performance report information, and school data (attendance, discipline, and enrollment) to enable them to select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	**Additional Teachers to Reduce Class Sizes**	**Improving Mathematics Instruction-Grades K-6 (CCSS)**
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	To increase student achievement in Language Arts Literacy, Math and Science as evidenced by student scores on the PARCC tests and thus, reflecting an increase number of students identified as proficient or advanced proficient on the state tests. To ensure the attainment of Annual Performance Targets (APT) at all grade levels specified by the New Jersey Department of Education.	To increase student achievement in Mathematics as evidenced by student scores on standardized tests such as NJASK (2014) and PARCC (2015) and thus, reflect an increase in the number of students in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 being identified as proficient or advanced proficient on the state tests. In addition, an increased emphasis on interventions for bilingual students in the primary grades is indicated due to the results of ACCESS tests; and SGO benchmark tests in language arts. To ensure the attainment of APT at all grade levels as measured by the NJASK/PARCC tests.
Describe the root causes of the problem	The 2014 NJASK results indicated that our LAL and Math scores are not yet at the level acceptable to the building administration and the district, and thus, in our opinion we feel that smaller classes will provide students with increased individualized attention in both reading and writing skills that will reflect positive gains in both LAL and Math test results. Educational research studies have consistently identified a positive relationship between reduced class size (especially for economically disadvantages and minority students) and improved student performance. Thus, to ensure that our students can meet the stringent benchmarks of NCLB as measured by the PARCC tests, smaller class sizes at the elementary level (Grades K-6) will play an integral part in guaranteeing higher levels of student achievement in math and language	Using state and classroom assessment data it appears that teachers will have to continue to emphasize problem solving skills, reinforcing computational skills and emphasizing the importance of close reading in mathematics in addition to addressing the specific standards at each grade level. In addition, many of our ELL students continue to lack a strong vocabulary foundation in either language ,which often hampers their math conceptual skills.

	arts.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Schoolwide (LAL) Schoolwide (Math) Hispanic (LAL) Hispanic (Math) Economically Disadvantaged (LAL) Economically Disadvantaged (Math)	Schoolwide (Math) Hispanic (Math) Economically Disadvantaged (Math)
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Guidance for Class-Size Reduction Program: April 2000 *The Principles of Educational Reform* *Wenglinsky, H., 1997.* *When money matters: How educational expenditures improve student performance and how they don't?* *The Student Teacher Achievement Ratio—Tennessee's Project STAR and Project Challenge program results (1999)* Pate-Bain, H., Fulton, D., and Boyd-Zaharias, J. (2000) *Effects of Class-Size Reduction in the early grades (K-3) on High School Performance: preliminary results (1999) from Project STAR, Tennessee's Longitudinal Class-Size Study* Wisconsin's Student Achievement Guarantee in Education, Major Evaluation Findings (1996-1998) *RAND* corporation's evaluation of *Class Size Reduction (CSR)* Bain, H. et al. (1989) A Study of First Grade Effective Teaching Practices from the Project Star Class Size Research	Mathematics Teaching in the 21st Century (MT21) Using a standards based learning environment within the elementary classroom Halpern, D., Aronson, J., Reimer, N., Simpkins, S., Star, J., & Wentzel, K. (2007) Encouraging Girls in Math and Science: A Practice Guide Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J., Witzel.B. ((2009) Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practice guide.aspx?sid=2. Woodward, J., Beckmann, S., Driscoll, M., Franke, M., Herzig, P., Jitendra, A., Koedinger, K.R., & Ogbuehi, P. (2012) Improving mathematical problem solving in grades 4 through 8: A Practice Guide Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

		Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Differentiated instructional strategies, formative and summative assessments that drive instruction and lesson planning reflecting DOK and critical thinking are aligned with the district curriculum and reflective of the rigor required by the Common Core State Standards. Educational research studies have consistently identified a positive relationship between reduced class size (especially for economically disadvantages and minority students) and improved student performance. In a smaller classroom setting, students can meet the stringent benchmarks of NCLB as measured by the PARCC tests.	Differentiated instructional strategies, formative and summative assessments that drive instruction and lesson planning reflecting DOK (Depth of Knowledge) and critical thinking skills are aligned with the district curriculum and reflective of the rigor required by the Common Core State Standards.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process

Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3
Name of priority problem	**Improving ELA Instruction-Grades K-6 (CCSS)**
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	To increase student achievement in ELA as evidenced by student scores on standardized tests such as NJASK (2014) and PARCC (2015) and thus, reflect an increase in the number of students in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 being identified as proficient or advanced proficient on the state tests. In addition, an increased emphasis on interventions for bilingual students in the primary grades is indicated due to the results of ACCESS tests and SGO benchmark tests in language arts. To ensure the attainment of APT at all grade levels as measured by the NJASK/PARCC tests.
Describe the root causes of the problem	Students' reading comprehension skills are not as strong as their math skills as evidenced by the statistical comparison of Language Arts Literacy scores within the subsets of reading and writing. However, we recognize that reading comprehension plays an integral role in both the ELA and Math standards as well as serving as a predictor for success in college and career readiness. In addition, we recognize that many of our ELL students enter our school with a weak vocabulary foundation in the home language and/or the second language, which often hampers their development of effective reading comprehension and/or decoding skills. With the increased demands of the Common Core State Standards, many of our students will need effective interventions to ensure that they can meet these more rigorous standards.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Schoolwide (LAL) Hispanic (LAL) Economically Disadvantaged (LAL)
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Gersten, R., Compton., D., Connor, C.M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., and Tilly, W.D. (2008) Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention and multi-tier intervention for reading in the primary grades. A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Gersten, R., Baker, S., Collins, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Scarcella, R., and Shanahan, T., (2007) Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Olsen, C.B., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutcheon, D., Olinghuse, N. Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers. A Practice Guide., Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Schatschneider, C and Torgeson, J., (2010) Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, A Practice Guide, Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Students' reading comprehension skills are not as strong as their math skills as evidenced by the statistical comparison of Language Arts Literacy scores within the subsets of

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

	reading and writing. However, we recognize that reading comprehension plays an integral role in both the ELA and Math standards as well as serving as a predictor for success in college and career readiness. In addition, we recognize that many of our ELL students enter our school with a weak vocabulary foundation in the home language and/or the second language, which often hampers their development of effective reading comprehension and/or decoding skills. With the increased demands of the Common Core State Standards, many of our students will need effective interventions to ensure that they can meet these more rigorous standards.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . "

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA and Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Data Driven differentiated instruction to provide individualized assistance in LAL and mathematics within a small group setting to ensure that students attain proficiency or advanced proficiency scores on the PARCC tests and thus, enabling the school to meet the state's Annual Performance Target benchmarks.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades Gersten R., Baker, S., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P. and Scarcella, R. Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Educational Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C.,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCE E 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/. Mathematics Teaching in the 21st Century [MT21] (2008) Using a standards based learning environment with in the elementary classroom. Halpern, D., Aronson, J., Reimer, N., Simpkins, S., Star, J., & Wentzel, K. (2007) Encouraging Girls in Math and Science: A Practice Guide Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J., Witzel.B. ((2009) Assisting Students

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practice guide.aspx?sid=2. Woodward, J., Beckmann, S., Driscoll, M., Franke, M., Herzig, P., Jitendra, A., Koedinger, K.R., & Ogbuehi, P. (2012) Improving mathematical problem solving in grades 4 through 8: A Practice Guide Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
ELA	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Intensive and leveled reading groups utilizing the online programs of ***Reading A-Z, Vocabulary A-Z, and/or RazKids*** to systematically integrate across all content areas the essential reading components of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension into reinforcement	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Progress Monitoring of all students on a bi-weekly basis using the Reading A-Z guided reading program and home/school Running Records of fluency and comprehension for each student Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. Weekly Unit and Selection Tests from *Treasures* basal series	Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades Gersten R., Baker, S., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P. and Scarcella, R. *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades* *Washington, DC: National Center for Education* Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Educational Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		opportunities at home as well as to track student progress using a leveled reading approach that is statistically correlated with the current basal series, *Treasures* and DRA2 tests.			Thome, C., *Bringing the Common Core Standards to the Classroom (2012)* Retrieved from http://www.readinga-z.com Klein, A.F., *Providing differentiated reading instruction to meet the individual needs of students (2009)* Retrieved from http://www.readinga-z.com/updates/reading_az_white_paper.pdf
Math ELA	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Intensive and leveled instruction and assessment utilizing assessment and instructional software (i.e. Moby Max, IXL, Reading A-Z, Vocabulary A-Z, Writing A-Z) to differentiate instruction in ELA and Math with an emphasis on problem solving,	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo Vice Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		fluency, comprehension and vocabulary development. In addition, the data produced by this software application will enable teachers to monitor student progress and drive classroom instruction.			Gersten R., Baker, S., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P. and Scarcella, R. Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Educational Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCE E 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/. Mathematics Teaching in the 21st Century [MT21] (2008) Using a standards based learning environment within the elementary classroom.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					Halpern, D., Aronson, J., Reimer, N., Simpkins, S., Star, J., & Wentzel, K. (2007) Encouraging Girls in Math and Science: A Practice Guide Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J., Witzel.B. ((2009) Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Instituted of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practice guide.aspx?sid=2. Woodward, J., Beckmann, S., Driscoll, M., Franke, M., Herzig, P., Jitendra, A., Koedinger, K.R., & Ogbuehi, P. (2012) Improving mathematical problem solving in grades 4 through 8: A Practice Guide Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
ELA Math Computer Skills	All students including:	Inclusion of dedicated PARCC preparation periods (keyboarding) to	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo,	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with	Bunch, G., Kibler, A., Pimentel, S., *Realizing Opportunities for English Learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	prepare students to effectively utilized the technological features on the PARCC tests as well as an infused model of SAMR. Purchase of classroom licenses to supplement current keyboarding program so that students can become proficient in utilizing the various computer components on the PARCC tests.	Vice Principal	pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels. Monthly assessment data provided to building administration	Nelson, J., Perfetti, C., Liben, D., and Liben, M., *Measures of Text Difficulty: Testing their Predictive Value for Grade Levels and Student Performance* NAEP, *Lessons Learned from the 2012Computer Based Assessment Study.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/writing/pdf/grade_4_writing_summary.pdf
ELA/Math	Migrant	NA			
ELA/Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless	Class Size Reduction	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	The Principles of Educational Reform: Guidance for Class-Size Reduction Program (April 2000) The Schooling Practices That Matter Most (2000) by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	ELLs Economically Disadvantaged				
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Each grade level team will develop a common and balanced system of assessments and then the teachers will grade some of these formative assessments collaboratively to track student progress across the grade level as well as develop uniform grade level expectations of proficiency. Submission of grade level assessment data provided monthly to building administration.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Grade Level Teachers	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	Black, P., and William, D. (1998) *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment* Boston, Carol (2002) *The Concept of Formative Assessment. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* Gallagher, C. & Worth, P. (2008) *Formative Assessment Policies, Programs, and Practices in the Southwest Region* Honey, M. (2005) *Promoting Student Achievement with Research Based Assessment with Formative Benefits*
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities	Use of grade level teams to examine and analyze standardized test data and to disaggregate test	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample	Black, P., and William, D. (1998) *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment* Boston, Carol (2002) *The Concept of Formative Assessment. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	data by class, teacher, and subgroups in an effort to ascertain grade level strengths and weaknesses and then create individualized prescriptive plans to address deficiencies	Pandolfo, Vice Principal	work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	Gallagher, C. & Worth, P. (2008) *Formative Assessment Policies, Programs, and Practices in the Southwest Region* Honey, M. (2005) *Promoting Student Achievement wit Research Based Assessment with Formative Benefits* Hamilton, L, Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., Wayman, J. (2009) *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making* A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov//ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Increase math fluency of basic fact recall for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division using direct instruction, online practice, (i.e. Moby Max, IXL) and individualized student practice to enhance math computational skills.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. and Witzel, B. *Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RTI) for Elementary and Middle Schools.* A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov//ncee/wwc/Practice*Guide.aspx?sid=2*.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Grade level planning of cross-curricular units that reflect the rigor and complexity of reading passages as specified by the CCSS and NJDOE Model Curriculum	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels.	http://www.state.nj.us/education/sca/ppt/gears/MSUPARCC.pdf Bunch, G., Kibler, A., Pimentel, S., *Realizing Opportunities for English Learners in the Common Core English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards* Nelson, J., Perfetti, C., Liben, D., and Liben, M., *Measures of Text Difficulty: Testing their Predictive Value for Grade Levels and Student Performance*
ELA/Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs	Increased use of Professional Learning Committees that address specific building concerns that may impede academic achievement	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All teachers	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff	Hamilton, L, Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., Wayman, J. (2009) *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making* A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov//ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Economically Disadvantaged			members at all grade levels.	Black, P., and William, D. (1998) *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment* Boston, Carol (2002) *The Concept of Formative Assessment. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* Gallagher, C. & Worth, P. (2008) *Formative Assessment Policies, Programs, and Practices in the Southwest Region* Honey, M. (2005) *Promoting Student Achievement wit Research Based Assessment with Formative Benefits*
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Transition of teacher directed instruction presented across multiple forms of media to a blended, cross-curricular instructional approach with an emphasis on differentiated instruction to better address the specific needs of individual students in an effort to improve academic achievement.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Grade Level Teachers	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets Examination of lesson plans and verification of lessons during administrative classroom walk-throughs	*Learner and Instructional Factors Influencing Learning Outcomes within a Blended Learning Environment.* http://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=14364522&AN=44785115&h=JMthgQUhtt0nlpMRKUGcVTpERuR6hIHVjCmMUQQy2%2b%2fqF8TYrXd5He1Brj4VZufHxqrRg%2b%2btUArqxcCitYqLYQ%3d%3d&crl=c *Blending in: The Extent and Promise of Blended Education in the United States* Allen, I. Elaine; Seaman, Jeff; Garrett, Richard http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED529930
ELA Math	All students including:	Ensuring content specific vocabulary is embedded in	Kathryn Rutan, Principal	Attainment of Annual Performance Targets	Hamilton, L, Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., Wayman, J. (2009) *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Science Social Studies	Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	special area classes such as art, health, science, and social studies so as to scaffold LAL/Math instruction in mainstream classrooms.	and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Examination of lesson plans and verification of lessons during administrative classroom walk-throughs	*Making* A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov//ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=12 Black, P., and William, D. (1998) *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment* Boston, Carol (2002) *The Concept of Formative Assessment. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation* What Works Clearinghouse: WWC Quick Review of the Article, "Teaching Science as a Language: A 'Content-First' Approach to Science Teaching
ELA Math Science Social Studies	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	*Increase student technology skills and overall student achievement by developing and implementing student centered lessons that effectively infuse technology and address higher order thinking skills in accordance with the SAMR model for technology integration.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Attainment of Annual Performance Target Benchmarks in Grades 3-6 Student Portfolios with pre/post assessments, sample work and report card grades Attainment of Student Growth Objectives by all staff members at all grade levels	Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide(N CE E 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx# pubsearch. Campuzano, L., Dynarski, M., Agodini, R., & Rall, K. (2009). *Effectiveness of reading and mathematics software products: Findings from two student cohorts* (NCEE 2009-4041). Washington, DC: National Center

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Wijekumar, K. K., Meyer, B. J. F., & Lei, P. (2012). Large-scale randomized controlled trial with 4th graders using intelligent tutoring of the structure strategy to improve nonfiction reading comprehension. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 60*(6), 987–1013.

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA & Mathematics Grades 1-6	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs	**Extended Day Tutoring**: To address the varied and diverse needs and skills of at risk students in grades 3-6 as identified by homeroom teachers and standardized	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Daily Attendance statistics, student portfolios, and PARCC results	Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) *Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* Gersten, R., Baker, S., Collins, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Scarcella, R., and Shanahan, T., (2007) *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide.* Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of

	Economically Disadvantaged	testing results			Educational Sciences, U.S. Department. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Olsen, C.B., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutcheon, D., Olinghuse, N. Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers. A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Schatschneider, C and Torgeson, J., (2010) Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, A Practice Guide,. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
ELA & Mathematics Grades 5 - 6	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	**Extended Year Tutoring:** Saturday morning classes for Grades 5 & 6 students to address the specific and diverse needs of students in this grade level as identified by LAL and Math teachers, report card grades and	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Daily Attendance statistics, student portfolios, grade level SGO and PARCC results	Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) *Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* Gersten, R., Baker, S., Collins, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Scarcella, R., and Shanahan, T., (2007) *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide.* Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch

		standardized testing results.			Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Olsen, C.B., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutcheon, D., Olinghuse, N. Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers. A Practice Guide. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Schatschneider, C and Torgeson, J., (2010) Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, A Practice Guide,. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
ELA & Mathematics Grades K-5	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	**Extended-year Summer Program:** Providing meaningful summer school opportunities to improve academic achievement for all students grades K-6.	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Daily Attendance statistics, student portfolios, grade level SGO and PARCC results	Gersten, R., & Compton, D. et al (2009) *Response to Intervention: A Research Review Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* Gersten, R., Baker, S., Collins, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Scarcella, R., and Shanahan, T., (2007) *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide.* Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Olsen, C.B., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutcheon, D., Olinghuse, N. Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers. A Practice Guide.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

					Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Schatschneider, C and Torgeson, J., (2010) Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, A Practice Guide,. Washington, DC: National Center for Regional Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from What Works.ed.gov/publications/practice guide.
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Strategy**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Strategy** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA Math	All students including:	*Provide job-embedded professional	Kathryn Rutan, Principal	Attendance of staff members at the various	Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	development opportunities that correlate to the Common Core State Standards and PARCC tests in order to improve classroom instruction.	and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	professional development opportunities provided by the district and/or school. Staff evaluation of the professional development opportunities Student performance data using formative and summative assessments PARCC test results	for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless	Teacher empowerment opportunities at faculty meetings, mini-workshops, at grade level meetings to share current	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal	Inclusion of research based instructional strategies in lesson planning and delivery Student	Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools* (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies. Ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	research and best practices with other staff members. These monthly professional development activities will focus on improving student achievement within the building.	All Teachers	performance data using formative and summative assessments PARCC test results	Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	Utilization of grade level meetings to examine data specific to the grade level that might enhance or impede academic achievement. Then, as a grade level develop appropriate measures to address their	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Student Performance Data –formative and summative assessments Classroom Data Sheets Standards checklist to analyze consistent implementation of targeted state standards	Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools* (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies. Ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/ Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		concerns.			*Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	On-site professional development opportunities such as online discussions, webinars, CCSS based discussion groups using electronic platforms to enable teachers to observe sound educational practices and discuss successful implementation at North Dover School	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Student Performance Data –formative and summative assessments Classroom Data Sheets Standards checklist to analyze consistent implementation of targeted state standards	Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools* (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies. Ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/ Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf
ELA	All students	*Literacy and Math on-site	Kathryn Rutan,	Student	Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., &

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs Economically Disadvantaged	*Professional Development resource personnel from nationally recognized PD providers to model, critique and offer suggestions for classroom instruction across all grade levels	Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Performance Data –formative and summative assessments Classroom Data Sheets Standards checklist to analyze consistent implementation of targeted state standards	Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools* (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.Ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/ Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf
ELA Math	All students including: Students with Disabilities Homeless ELLs	*Instructional modeling of effective instructional strategies using experienced and successful staff members within North	Kathryn Rutan, Principal and Patrick Pandolfo, Vice Principal All Teachers	Feedback Surveys Student Performance Data –formative and summative assessments Classroom Data Sheets	Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools* (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.Ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/ Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., and Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008- 4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Economically Disadvantaged	Dover School and providing interested teachers with substitutes so that they might observe and discuss lessons that reflect the rigor of the CCSS with staff volunteers		Standards checklist to analyze consistent implementation of targeted state standards	Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http:// ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides. *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf

***Use an asterisk to denote new programs**.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (*Evaluation*). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

   The building administration, teachers, parents and community stakeholders will monitor and evaluate the schoolwide plan for 2015-16 by carefully examining the purpose of the schoolwide program, the required components, and the contents of the school plan at the fall and spring Title I Patent Advisory Council meetings.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

   Current educational research suggests that highly successful schools must have significant and sustained levels of parental involvement. In our school of nearly eight hundred students, there is a tendency for only a small percentage of parents to become involved in the education of their children. Thus, it will be a challenge to involve more families in the implementation process because many of our parents are reluctant to take an active role at school events due to multiple work schedules, lack of reliable transportation, and child care issues.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

   Effective and ongoing communication between home and school will be the first step in this process of obtaining the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders. In addition, the school will continue to provide communication materials in both English and Spanish so that parents can fully comprehend important notices as well as translators at parent meetings and events. Next, increasing home/school collaboration is crucial and to do so, our school will need to include varied and diverse professional development opportunities for parents so they can fully comprehend the importance of their roles as parents in their child's educational career. Finally, parent feedback and involvement data will be used to drive/support the process.

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

   Staff surveys, open discussion forums, and collaborative activities will be used to gauge the perception of the staff regarding the implementation of the schoolwide plan.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

   Parent/community surveys in both English and Spanish as well as open/honest discussions at parent meetings will be noted and utilized to gauge the perceptions of the community.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

   First, the school will identify students experiencing difficulty in mastering the CCSS by employing multiple assessments such as standardized testing, SGO benchmark testing, SGP results, report card grades, formative assessments in the classroom and teacher observations. Using common prep periods and grade level meetings, teachers will utilize the results of their data analysis to develop effective interventions such as differentiated instruction, blended instruction and other research based practices to address the needs of the students.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

   To be effective, instructional interventions will be regular and timely. These interventions will be dependent upon student performance data and specifically tailored to the needs of each student. These interventions will occur across all content areas in the classroom during the school day as well as in extended day/year programs provided by Title I funding.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

   Our school will use computer adaptive assessments to track student progress, plan individualized and differentiated instruction within the classroom, and provide familiarity with online assessments for students in an effort to prepare them for the PARCC tests.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

   Quantitative data gleaned from the PARCC assessments and classroom performance as evidenced by formative/summative assessments (SGO benchmarks, report card grades) will be used to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

    The results of the schoolwide program evaluation will be disseminated to all stakeholders at the Parent Advisory Council meetings held in the fall and spring each year, at appropriate PTA meetings, and during faculty meetings focusing upon student achievement.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Multiple cross-curricular family events and/or programs (grade level specific) throughout the year that actively engage the participants/audience in an effort to promote academics, which will serve to encourage/reinforce home/school connection and reflect the rigorous demands of the CCSS. Distribution of commercial materials to support/reinforce these programs	Administration and Teaching Staff	• Number of Attendees • Parent Survey and Feedback Form • Staff Survey	Herman, R., et al. (2008) *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools*
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Increase current Title I Parent Lending Library with books and videos for families to read/view together as well as parenting materials that emphasis/support our home/school connection.	Administration and Teaching Staff	• Circulation Numbers • Parent Survey and Feedback Form • Staff Survey	Herman, R., et al. (2008) *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA Math	All Students including ELLs, Special Education, Homeless, and Economically Disadvantaged	Distribution of commercial newsletters emphasizing home/school connections such as *Reading Connection, Math& Science Connection, and Home School Connection* *Cost of materials: $229 annually for each of the following:* • *Home/School Connection* • *Reading Connection-Intermediate* • *Reading Connection-Beginning* • *Math& Science Connection*	Administration and Teaching Staff	• Parent Survey and Feedback Form	Herman, R., et al. (2008) *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools*

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

The priority problems identified in the needs assessment emphasized a need to increase our percentage of proficient readers using the best research-based reading practices to improve comprehension and promote reading enjoyment as well as to prepare them for college and workplace. Our short-term goal is to increase student achievement but our long-term goal is to ensure that our students are prepared for today's entry-level careers, freshman-level college courses, and workforce training programs" (http://www.corestandards.org/what-parents-should-know/). Thus, parent programs will need to provide families with specific strategies and suggestions that are grounded in research and best practices that will help students improve their reading skills and become competent readers.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

Parents are involved in the development of the School-wide Plan through their participation on the Parent Advisory Council committee. Additionally, parents are invited to attend and actively participate in two (2) Title I Parental Involvement meeting to suggest ideas, express opinions, and/or review the current plan. These meetings are held twice a year in the fall and spring. Parent opinions are also solicited through parent surveys distributed in the spring of the year to all North Dover families.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

The parental involvement policy is sent home with parents during the fall parent conferences and is available on the school and/or district websites.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

The School-Parent Compact is reviewed and revised, as necessary, during the two (2) annual Title I Parental Involvement meetings.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

The school-parent compact is sent home with the parents or students, and it is also available on the school website.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

Student achievement is reported at Board of Education meetings, in which the principal presents the school's assessment results and reviews the school's NJDOE School Performance Report. In addition, the principal reviews this important information at each of the Title I Parent Advisory Council Meetings.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III? *The district has met its annual measurable objectives for Title III.*

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

The school's disaggregated assessment results are reported at Board of Education meetings, in which the principal presents the school's assessment results. In addition, the principal reviews this important information at each of the Title I Parent Advisory Council Meetings.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

Parents are involved in the development of the School-wide Plan through their participation during the Parent Advisory Council meetings. Parents may also offer suggestions within the parent surveys distributed each year to all the families. Additionally, parents are encouraged to participate in the development of the school's Parental Involvement Policy.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

In order to inform parents about their child's assessment results, teachers distribute each student's individual NJASK/PARCC score report(s) at our annual parent conferences and if a parent is unable to attend, and then the reports are mailed home. In addition, parents are provided with quarterly marking period grades and weekly/bi-weekly progress reports, as necessary. Furthermore, parent-teacher conferences are held at least once a year; however, they are also scheduled throughout the course of the year at the request of teachers and/or parents.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

The majority of the PI funds during 2015-16 will be spent to enhance the home-school connection across all content areas (i.e. commercial reading, math, and student success newsletters such as Home School Connection, Reading Connection, Math Connection, Math and Science Connections; as well as books/videos for our Title I Family Library in an effort to improve academic achievement of all students especially students with disabilities and bilingual students. Also, an emphasis on providing varied and multiple grade specific cross-curricular family literacy and math nights that will actively engage families and students in learning activities that will support the CCSS and enhance classroom instruction. In addition, some of the funds may also be used to pay North Dover staff for serving as facilitators for the Academic Evenings with Families, Parenting Workshops.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	50 teachers 100% HQT	**District Professional Development Plan:** Through the implementation of the 2014-15 Professional Development Plan, there was a continuation of teachers obtaining hours through participation in sustained, job-embedded opportunities [i.e. *Critical Thinking; Reading for Meaning* webinars] that promoted the achievement of the Common Core State Standards, Dover Board of Education Goals and building objectives, Professional Development Standards for NJ Educators, and No Child Left Behind Legislation. Professional Development within the district supported the key points of the NSDC's definition of professional development by having the majority of teachers in the district accrue most of their hours through participation in professional development opportunities offered on-site, during the school year, and supported by external assistance. Some teachers also demonstrated professional growth by attending graduate school in content specific courses. In addition, North Dover School utilizes a Collegial Assistance Program in which teachers can visit a colleague's classroom to observe effective classroom management strategies, a blended instructional approach in which technology supports/enhances classroom learning or the successful implementation of cross-curricular units of study reflective of the rigor of the Common Core State Standards. Additionally, new staff members are provided with clear and definitive information about district/building policies, protocols and procedures within a formal mentoring program so that they fully comprehend the expectations of the building and district administration. The utilization of the current NJDOE teacher evaluation process clearly elucidates teachers' strengths and weaknesses in the classroom and so, the building administration is

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
		responsible for providing staff members with specific recommendations and/or or professional development opportunities to support the staff member.
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	15	A clear and concise job description that includes necessary qualifications, role and responsibilities for the paraprofessionals is the foundation for the retention of HQ staff members. Paraprofessionals are closely supervised by the building administration to determine how well they work with their assigned teacher, their level of competency in the classroom setting, and their interactions with students. During the formal and informal evaluation process, paraprofessionals are provided with specific feedback for improvement, commendations for positive contributions to class/school, and an opportunity to share insights or concerns about the position.
	100% HQT	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
Through the implementation of the 2014-15 Professional Development Plan, there was a continuation of teachers obtaining professional development hours through participation in sustained, job-embedded opportunities that promoted the achievement of the Common Core State Standards, Dover Board of Education Goals and North Dover building objectives, Professional Development Standards for NJ Educators, and No Child Left Behind Legislation. Professional Development within the district supported the key points of the NSDC's definition of professional development by having the majority of teachers in the district accrue most of their hours through participation in professional development opportunities offered on-site, during the school year, and supported by external assistance. Some teachers also demonstrated professional growth by attending graduate school in content specific courses. *Based upon the provisions of TEACHNJ Act and Achieve NJ, every school must establish a School Improvement Panel (ScIP) whose role is to ensure, oversee, and support the implementation of the district's evaluation, professional development (PD), and mentoring policies at the school level. The ScIP also ensures that teachers have a strong voice and significant opportunity to help shape evaluation procedures within each school.* *(http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SchoolImprovementPanelandImprovingEvaluation.pdf)* The ScIP Committee at North Dover School will continue to survey the staff to ascertain the needs and preferences of the staff members and then determine meaningful professional development activities that are best suited to advance the skills set of all teachers, augment classroom instruction and improve student achievement.	Administration and ScIP Committee Members